

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached drawings include changes to Figs. 1, 2, 3a, 5 and 6 and replace the original sheets, inclusive of Figs. 1, 2, 3a-4b, and 5-6.

FIG. 1 – delete reference F

FIG. 2 – delete numeral 79; extend lead line of numeral 37 to reference the tire's axis

FIG. 3a – change numeral "46" to – 38 --; redirect lead line of numeral 62

FIG. 5 – insert numerals 76A, and 77A (two occurrences)

FIG. 6 – delete V and its lead line (both occurrences)

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (Figs. 1, 2, 3a-4b, 5-6)

**REMARKS**

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Bellinger for the courteous interview accorded to the undersigned. During the interview, independent claims 1, 17 and 31 were discussed.

Regarding claim 1, that claim has been amended to ensure that the valve's supply line side and reception chamber side are positively recited. Pauliukonis does not disclose a valve whose movable stopper 4a is movable between open and closed positions in response to a fluid pressure differential between the supply line side and the reception chamber side, as recited in claim 1. In Pauliukonis, the stopper 4a is movable in response to a pressure differential between the supply line side 24 and a pilot actuation port 21. The pressure at the reception chamber side 16a does not influence the pressure differential which controls the valve stopper. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 distinguishes patentably over the proposed combination of Battocchio, Pauliukonis and Knorr-Bremse which relies on the teachings of Pauliukonis for the valve structure and operation. The Examiner indicated he will reconsider claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, the Examiner indicated, during the interview, that a rejection of that claim over prior art may have been inadvertently omitted from the Final Rejection and that if a rejection of claim 17 over prior art is forthcoming, the finality of the previous Office action will be withdrawn.

As concerns claim 31, it was pointed out to the Examiner that while Genna discloses to position a valve in a wheel hub (actually two valves 42 and 83), it is disclosed to position the valves remotely of the wheel axis, in direct contrast to claim 31 which recites the movable element of the valve as movable along such axis.

Thus, Genna tends to teach away from that claimed concept. Pauliukonis discloses a valve, but not in connection with a tire and certainly not as being arranged such that the valve's stopper moves along a wheel axis. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 31 distinguishes patentably over the proposed combination of Battocchio, Pauliukonis, Knorr-Bremse and Genna, none of which discloses a valve element movable along a wheel axis.

As regards the various objections to the drawings, the drawings have been amended to overcome those objections.

Concerning section no. 7, the objections therein have been corrected by appropriate amendments to the claims.

As regards section no. 9, the word "free" in the expression – free differential valve – in the claims has been deleted. Also, the phrase "loss of head device" has been deleted.

The expression "starting from" in claim 7 has been changed to –intersecting--.

Claim 17 has been amended to reinsert – non-return – to describe the valve.


In light of the foregoing amendments and comments, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 14, 2007

By:

  
Alan E. Kopecki  
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620